

916.
H 356

Hecketsweiler

Joseph Galloway And His Plan Of Union

JOSEPH GALLOWAY
AND
HIS PLAN OF UNION

BY

ROY THOMAS HECKETSWEILER

THESIS

for the

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

IN

HISTORY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1916

1916
H356

2 UC 10
CRAB

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

June 1 1916

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Roy Thomas Hackett

ENTITLED Joseph Galloway and His
Plan of Union.

IS APPROVED BY ME AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Bachelor of Arts in History
in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Ewart B. Bunn

Instructor in Charge

APPROVED: Ewart B. Bunn

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF History

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Sources.

Galloway, Joseph,

- I. A Candid Examination of the Claims of Great Britain and the Colonies. 1780.
- II. Examination of Joseph Galloway, in 1780, before the House of Commons of Great Britain.
- III. Letters to a Nobleman, 1780.
- IV. A Letter to the Right Honorable Lord Viscount H--e. 1779

Vol. I. New York 1780.

Galloway, Joseph,

- I. Historical and Political Reflections. 1780.
- II. Cool Thoughts. 1780.
- III. Tucker, Josiah.
Dispassionate Thoughts. 1780.
- IV. Plain Truth. 1780.

Vol. II. London. 1780.

Moore, Frank,

Diary of American Revolution. Vol. I. New York. 1863.

Wells, William Vincent,

Life and Public services of Samuel Adams.
Vol. III. Boston. 1865.

Reed, Henry.

Life of Joseph Reed,
American Biography -- Jared Sparks. Ser. 2.

Vol. VIII. Boston. 1864.

Sparks, Jared.

The Works of Benjamin Franklin,
Vol. VII and VIII. Boston. 1839.

Stille, Charles J., LL.D.,

The Life and Times of John Dickinson, Vol. I, II.
Philadelphia. 1891.

Adams, Charles Francis,

Work of John Adams with Life of Author, Vol. I,
II, III, IV, VII, IX. Boston. 1851.

Force, Peter,

American Archives. Series IV. Vol. I.
Washington. 1837.

Smyth, Alber Henry,

Life and Writings of Benjamin Franklin. Vol. VI,
X. New York and London. 1905-7.

Ford, Paul Leicester,


Writings of John Dickinson. Vol. I. Pennsylvania. 1895.

Morgan, Hon. Christopher,

Documentary History of New York. Vol. IV.
Albany, New York 1849-51.

Ricord, Frederick W. and Nelson, Wm.,

New Jersey Archives. Vol. X. Newark, New
Jersey. 1886.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/josephgallowayhi00heck>

SECONDARY MATERIAL.

Howard, George Elliott, Ph.D.,

Preliminaries of the Revolution.

Vol. VIII. New York and London.

1905.

Van Tyne, Claud Halstead, Ph.D.,

The American Revolution. 1776-1783.

Vol. IX. New York and London.

1905.

Abbott, Jacob, American History --

War of the Revolution.

Vol. VII. New York and Boston.

1864.

Frothingham, Richard,

The Rise of the Republic of the United States.

Boston

1890.

Warren, Mrs. Mercy,

The Rise of the American Revolution.

Vol. I. Boston.

1805.

Pitkin, Timothy,

Political and Civil History of the United States
of America. Vol. I. New Haven.

1828.

Winsor, Justin,

Narrative and Critical History of America.

Vol. VI. Boston and New York.

1887.

Fiske, John,

The American Revolution.

Vol. I. Boston and New York.

1892.

Lecky, William Edward Hartpole,

The American Revolution. New York.

1908.

Fisher, Sydney George,

The Struggle for American Independence.
Vol. I. Philadelphia and London. 1908.

Trevelyan, Sir George Otto,

American Revolution.
Vol. II. New York and Bombay. 1905.

Tyler, Moses Coit,

The Literary History of the American Revolution.
Vol. I. New York and London. 1897.

The Magazine of American History.
Vol. I, III. New York and Chicago. 1879.

The Pennsylvania Magazine.
Vol. XXVI. Philadelphia. 1877.

Lincoln, Charles H.,

The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania.
University of Pennsylvania Series in History.
Vol. I. Philadelphia. 1901.

Sabine, Lorenzo,

Biographical Sketches of the Loyalists of the
American Revolution.
Vol. I. Boston. 1864.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

- Chapter I. Introductory Account of Joseph Galloway.
- Chapter II. Joseph Galloway in the Pennsylvania Assembly.
- Chapter III. Presentation of the Plan in the First
Continental Congress.
- Chapter IV. Reception of the Plan.
- Chapter V. European and Colonial Reasons for Presentation
of the Plan.
- Chapter VI. Galloway's Infidelity.
- Chapter VII. Failure of the Plan.
- Chapter VIII. Conclusion.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY ACCOUNT OF JOSEPH GALLOWAY.

In 1731 at West River, Anne Arundel, County, Maryland was born with lineage of respectability and high social standing, one of the clearest thinking statesmen of early American history. When quite young, Joseph Galloway, sought in Philadelphia a career in the legal profession. This city offered great advantages and attractions for the lawyer and soon he attained enviable success and became prominent. Before he was twenty he had been admitted to the bar and had been allowed to plead before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.¹ His ability as a lawyer is given expression in the fact that his practice extended to the courts of the Delaware Counties and even to the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Mr. Galloway is a typical example of the product of circumstances. Through inheritance he early became a large land-owner and by means of a successful career added materially to his landed holdings. In that early colonial period the methods of surveyors were careless and as a result not very accurate. Very often warrants were not recorded and conflicting claims arose. Thus due to his personal interests and to a public need, Mr. Galloway's legal work developed civilly rather than criminally. He became primarily a real estate lawyer, and versed himself in the intricacies and knotty questions to which rise was given by the peculiarly bad state into which property claims had fallen. Evidence of the success that he attained in this field is given by the demand made upon his

¹Baldwin Ernest H., Ph.D. Jos. Galloway, the Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 162.

services by the most important civil suits in the province of Pennsylvania from 1760 on.¹ This particular training peculiarly fitted him for the work he undertook in the Pennsylvania Assembly of which he became a member in 1756.

¹Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph.D. Jos. Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 164

CHAPTER II.

JOSEPH GALLOWAY IN THE PENNSYLVANIA ASSEMBLY.

On October 1st of this year occurred his election to the Assembly of the Province whose most influential leader then was Benjamin Franklin. Franklin held Galloway in high esteem which was to attend him for many years yet to come and was attested to in a letter written by him in 1774 (January 5th) to his son, William Franklin. In that letter he made reply to an intimation of alleged unfaithfulness on the part of Galloway in this statement, "No insinuations of the kind you mention, concerning Mr. G----- have reached me, and, if they had, it would have been without the least effect; as I have always had the strongest reliance on the steadiness of his friendship, and on the best grounds, the knowledge I have of his integrity, and the often repeated disinterested services he has rendered me."¹ In dealing with the issues that faced this Assembly these two men cooperated effectively and when Mr. Franklin with the speaker, Mr. Norris, was sent to England on the commission seeking to remove proprietary government, the weight of the home interests fell upon Mr. Galloway.²

Most unusual political conditions existed in the Province of Pennsylvania when Galloway became a member of its assembly. This body regarded its interests and those of the people it repre-

¹ Smyth, Albert Henry. The Writings of Benjamin Franklin, Vol. VI, page 174.

² Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 170.

sented as opposed to those of the Proprietors. Taxation, military defense and Governors' instructions were matters of bitter contention.¹ Pennsylvania had been founded and was then very largely under control of the Quakers whose religious principles forbade war or their support of it. Certain military measures had passed the assembly and although these were not compulsory, due to a distaste for them and possible fear of presently being coerced into enforcement of them, many Quakers had resigned their seats in the assembly.²

The French and Indian War was absorbing the attention of the colonies and in this province as well as the others existed the demand for military taxes, supplies, and services. The agitation was made the graver by the unrest among the frontiersmen of this province.³ These outer-rim settlers were largely Scotch-Irish and they had become greatly incensed by the reluctance of the assembly to act favorably in the way of supplying their lives and property with the means of defense against the hostility of the marauding Indians whose depredations were of French incitement. With conditions in this menacing state, Galloway assumed the duties of a public servant of Pennsylvania. Seemingly he was the man providentially fitted to step into this breach and rally the factions of contention to concerted action for their own welfare. He was fearless in taking definite action and his training had shown him what place in government the protection of property held.⁴ The assembly

¹Baldwin Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 168.

²Ibid Vol. 26, page 166.

³Lincoln Charles H. The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Publications Vol. I, page 98.

⁴Baldwin Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician, Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 166.

met on the 14th of October, 1756 and on the twentieth of that month Mr. Galloway was made the head of a committee "to prepare and bring in a Bill for prohibiting the exportation of Provisions, naval or warlike stores from this province to the French."¹ Early upon his entering the assembly he was pressed into leadership and during his service in that body was not released from the arduous duties of that position.

Early in 1757 he was placed upon the Indian Commission in which capacity he championed to a large extent the Quaker principles in dealing with the Indians. The Delaware and Shawanese Indians had joined the French in the war but then showed themselves desirous of peace providing their own grievances be redressed. They claimed that their lands had been sold unjustly and asked that the title deeds be produced and examined to verify their claims. The Proprietors were reluctant to consider the request but the Quakers desired taking a move in the direction that promised much in the way of lasting peace and believed the Indians to be only reasonable in their request.

The "Friendly Association" was organized by the Quakers for the purpose of inducing the governor to consider the redman's claim and to make itself felt among the Indians in varied unofficial friendly ways. Galloway and William Masters urged Governor Denny through correspondence that he assume a conciliatory attitude toward the complaints made by the Indians, praying that favorable negotiations might be effected with them.² However, the governor continued to be arbitrarily disputations even objecting to the "Friendly

¹ Votes of Pennsylvania Assembly, October 20th, 1756.

² Baldwin Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 172.

Association" being represented at a coming conference between him and the Indians. They refused to confer in the absense of this association and continued obdurate until two years later when Galloway again took up matters that concerned their property interests.¹ The effect of these Indian difficulties was to widen the breach between the Proprietary and the Assembly.

Mr. Galloway's services fitted in most judiciously in the framing of bills concerning warrants and surveys, but his activity was felt no less in matters concerning appropriation bills, particularly for military supplies. In 1760 he won his point over the governor by compelling him to yield to the exclusive control on the part of the assembly in the expenditure of a hundred thousand pounds that an appropriation bill had allowed for military purposes.²

Frontier Indian troubles continued and culminated in the Paxton Riot early in 1764. Frontier defense, due to Quaker influence in the assembly, had not been forthcoming and the exasperation of the Scotch-Irish settlers was given vent in an atrocious massacre of the neighboring Indians. This deplorable act was denounced at Philadelphia and many Moravian Indian converts were lodged for safety in the barracks of that city. This so chagrined the frontiersmen that it incited an armed movement by them upon Philadelphia. When it became apprized of knowledge of that city's defense, the mob halted at Germantown and was dispersed by Franklin

¹Baldwin, Ernest H., Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician, Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 177.

²Ibid Vol. 26, page 178.

and Galloway upon their making conciliatory promises.¹ These measures were not carried out and Galloway incurred the lasting wrath of the "Paxton Boys."

A more direct occasion for the desire to abolish proprietorship is found in the quarrel over taxation. In 1759 Franklin had obtained from the Proprietors an agreement that provided that their unimproved lands should be assessed as low as the lowest rate at which similar lands of the people were assessed.² But in 1764 the governor returned to the assembly unsigned a bill granting fifty thousand pounds for an Indian campaign. This was his method of getting the assembly to grant his accompanying demand that the best unimproved lands of the proprietors be taxed at the rate set on the poorest land of the people. The Indian activities were so menacing that the assembly submitted to the governor's demand.

However, the assembly immediately reacted toward the mean advantage of which the governor had availed himself by appointing a committee to draw up the grievances of the province. Mr. Galloway headed the committee and on March 24th it submitted its report containing twenty-six resolutions. The chief of their causes for complaint were: the proprietors' private instructions to the deputy governor, their claims to exemption from taxation, their appointment of judges during pleasure, their abuse of the right to issue licenses to taverns, and their attempts to control the militia.³ The assembly adopted these resolutions and immediate steps were taken to gain sentiment in their support by circulating petitions

¹ Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 180.

² Ibid Vol. 26, page 181.

³ Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph. D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 181.

requesting a change of government. The Quakers as a body opposed the change but some of them signed these petitions. The proprietors seized this opportunity to accuse the popular party of using foul means by which to obtain such signatures.¹

This precipitated the agitation that attended the assembly election of 1764 in which both Franklin and Galloway were defeated.² Over this issue developed the bitter and permanent enmity between Galloway and John Dickinson.³ Dickinson was not a partisan of the proprietors but in this dispute proved himself one of their strongest allies. Galloway published a pamphlet containing a speech of his defending the assembly policy for a change from proprietary government to a royal government. Dickinson replied to this speech and scathingly attacked Galloway by laying his pen to a generous amount of biting sarcasm. In this reply he said, "Mr. Galloway, however, flatters himself, that the prejudices against us are not so ineradicably fixed, but that they may be easily overcome, and the province restored to her former credit."⁴ Happy should I be, if I could perceive the least prospect of so great a blessing." Again in the reply is read, "Mr. Galloway, before he quits 'this wise policy of settling the extensive newly acquired dominions' as he expresses himself, takes the opportunity of making an 'historical flourish' -- but unfortunately furnishes 'irrefragable demonstrations' that he is utterly unacquainted with the subject, on which

¹Ibid Vol. 26, page 182.

²Smyth, Albert Henry, Writings of Benjamin Franklin. Vol. X page 218.

³Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 186.

⁴Ford, Paul Leicester, Writings of John Dickinson. Vol. I. page 81.

he speaks."¹ Written disputes were published and circulated by Dickinson and Galloway containing counter-contradictions concerning whether or not the speech that Dickinson was pleased to call Galloway's pretended speech was ever really delivered before the assembly. Dickinson accused Galloway of attempting to put in print material that contained reflections upon him without first giving him a fair chance to defend himself in the same issue of that newspaper.² Thus continued throughout their political careers a back-biting war of words.

The year following his defeat of 1764 saw Galloway back in the assembly holding as prominent a place as before. Franklin was in England presenting the petition to the Crown and Galloway kept actively in touch with him but both men's efforts failed to effect the desired change of government.

The next great issue with which Mr. Galloway was vitally concerned is the Stamp Act of 1765. His attitude toward this measure was finely loyalist but accusations to the effect that he desired to see it enforced were false.³ He was opposed to parliamentary taxation without representation and wanted the act repealed. However, the act in itself did not raise in him the grave apprehensions that did the riotous resistance that accompanied its

¹Ford, Paul Leicester, Writings of John Dickinson, Vol. I, page 83.

²Ibid Vol. I, page 137.

³Baldwin Ernest H. Ph.D. Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 289.

attempted enforcement. In his opinion, "Parliamentary taxation with enforced law and order was a greater blessing than liberty with lawlessness."¹ He was more greatly alarmed by the probable dangers of mob rule than by the tyranny of Parliament. And it is no small tribute to his ability that is read in the fact that this year he sits in the assembly in spite of his active opposition to proprietary government and his not wholly unfavorable attitude toward the Stamp Act.

Mr. Galloway feared the rise of Presbyterianism and his misgivings were greatly strengthened by the Paxton Riot which of course was strongly colored by that faith in that it was perpetrated by the Scotch-Irish. As he viewed this situation it was laying the foundation for the establishment of republican principles and separation from England.

In 1766 Mr. Galloway and Mr. Hutchinson, then bitter rivals, entered a hotly contested race for the speakership of the assembly. The opposition against Galloway was strong and particularly active. His opponents employed the press to disseminate arguments drawn up stating why he should not be chosen. But a strong and steadily reliable element stood firm for the Quaker politician being thoroughly confident in his ability. Thus it was that he gained the seat in spite of the rising hostility against the Quaker element.² This position he held uninterruptedly until his election to the Continental Congress in 1774.

While serving in this capacity Indian troubles continued to harass the assembly and he was further beset by the disagreements

- - - - -

¹Ibid Vol. 26, page 289 to 290.

²Lincoln, Charles H. The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Publications Vol. I, page 77.

over paper money. Parliament prohibited colonial issuance of such money but Galloway believed it to have a very desirable utility in the purchase of government land.¹ His correspondence with Franklin in England was continued and urged that he continue to advocate the old scheme for a royal government. The unsettled condition of these years just preceding the Revolution in which it was evident that trouble was brewing often made Galloway very pessimistic and a number of times he considered resigning his seat in the assembly. At such times Franklin always gave him hearty encouragement believing his ability to be essential to American welfare.² Even under the wearing stress of this political pressure, Galloway's life was not without considerable enjoyment. The diary of a contemporary reveals a record of his often entertaining at home and of "frolics" and dinners at Greenwich Hall, a resort at which many of the assemblymen found recreation.³ Nor is it likely that many of these gatherings left the popular political questions undiscussed.

Thus it was by unwavering courage, by rallying to each new occasion, by dint of hard labor and thought, by unselfish interest in the welfare of his countrymen that this politician had prepared himself for the position he was to fill in an attempt to mould the destiny of the American Colonies.

¹Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph.D., Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 299.

²Baldwin, Ernest H. Ph.D., Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician. Pa. Mag. Vol. 26, page 297 and 298.

³Hiltzheimer, Jacob, "Diary."

CHAPTER III.

PRESENTATION OF THE PLAN IN THE FIRST CONTINENTAL CONGRESS.

It was Galloway's lot to figure in the nation's politics at the time when the country had to make the most important and far-reaching decision that it has ever before or since faced, namely political independence or political union with England. The ministry as the agent of the government of the mother country had so violently stirred the surface waters of American politics that they were seething; and Galloway well saw that to retain the sustaining calm of the under currents required immediate and definite action.

The Stamp Act of 1765; the tea tax and its resistance by the Boston Tea Party in 1773 and the Charleston damp storage; the three coercive acts of 1774 -- the closing of the Boston harbor, the remodelling of the Massachusetts Charter by the English Government, the extension of the jurisdiction of British marine courts to colonists; the Quebec Act; suppression of public meetings; quartering of British soldiers upon the colonists; and, imposition of taxation by Imperial authority were the grievances that had harrowed the public mind until it had reached the state that raised the spontaneous call for a concerted demand for redress.

For the purpose of formulating just such a demand the First Continental Congress was called and met at Philadelphia, on September 5th, 1774.¹ At this congress all the colonies but Georgia

¹Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774, Vol. I. pages 15 to 24

were represented. Galloway's services in the Pennsylvania Assembly had marked him as one of the men to become a member of its delegation. Upon the earnest solititation of that body he consented to act providing he be given unalterable instructions to which he could agree.¹ The assembly met his request by allowing him to draw up his own instructions. In effect these instructions would not let him act autside of the bounds of stating the rights and grievances of America, and to propose a plan of amicable accommodation of the differences between Great Britain and the colonies, and of a perpetual union. Although at this stage of the developments, independence was generally abhorred the instructions just related show clearly that Galloway had apprehended the possibilities of so agitated a situation.

This Continental Congress had little more than well begun its deliberations when on the 28th of September Mr. Galloway introduced for that body's consideration his "plan for a proposed union between Great Britain and the colonies" which was as follows:

Resolved,- That this Congress will apply to his Majesty for a redress of grievances, under which his faithful subjects in America labor, and assure him, that the colonies hold in abhorrence the idea of being considered independent communities on the British Government, and most ardently desire the establishment of a political union, not only among themselves, but with the mother state, upon those principles of safety and freedom which are essential in the constitution of all free Governments, and particularly that of

- - - - -

¹Winsor, Justin, Narrative and Critical History of America. Vol. VI, page 235.

Sparks, Works of Franklin, Vol. VIII. page 145.

the British Legislature. And as the colonies from their local circumstances cannot be represented in the Parliament of Great Britain, they will humbly propose to his Majesty, and his two Houses of Parliament, the following plan, under which the strength of the whole Empire may be drawn together on an emergency; the interests of both countries advanced; and the rights and liberties of America secured:

A Plan for a proposed Union between Great Britain and the colonies of New Hampshire, the Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, the three lower Counties on the Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

That a British and American Legislature, for regulating the administration of the general affairs of America, be proposed and established in America, including all the said colonies, within and under which government, each colony shall retain its present constitution and powers of regulating and governing its own internal police in all cases whatever:

That the said government be administered by a President General to be appointed by the King, and a Grand Council to be chosen by the representatives of the people of the several colonies in their respective Assemblies once in every three years:

That there shall be a new election of Members for the Grand Council every three years, and on the death, removal, or resignation of any member, his place shall be supplied by a new choice at the next sitting of Assembly of the colony he represented:

That the Grand Council shall meet once in every year if they shall think it necessary, and oftener, if occasions require, at

such time and place as they shall adjourn to at the last preceding meeting, or as they shall be called to meet at, by the President General on any emergency:

That the Grand Council shall have power to choose their Speaker, and shall hold and exercise all the like rights, liberties, and privileges as are held and exercised by and in the House of Commons of Great Britain:

That the President General shall hold his office during the pleasure of the king, and his assent shall be requisite to all Acts of the Grand Council, and it shall be his office and duty to cause them to be carried into execution:

That the President General, by and with the advice and consent of the Grand Council, hold and exercise all the legislative rights, powers, and authorities, necessary for regulating and administering all the general police and affairs of the colonies, in which Great Britain and the colonies, or any of them, the colonies in general, or more than one colony, are in any manner concerned as well civil and criminal as commercial:

That the said President General and Grand Council be an inferior and distinct branch of the British Legislature, united and incorporated with it for the aforesaid general purposes, and that any of the said general regulations may originate, and be formed and digested, either in the Parliament of Great Britain or in the said Grand Council, and being prepared, transmitted to the other for their approbation or dissent, and that the assent of both shall be requisite to the validity of all such general Acts and Statutes:

That in time of war, all bills for granting aids to the Crown, prepared by the Grand Council, and approved by the President

General, shall be valid and passed into a law without the assent of the British Parliament.¹

¹The Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774, Vol. I, page 49 to 51.

Force, Peter. American Archives Ser. IV, Vol. I, pages 905 and 906.

Wells, Wm. Vincent. Life and Public Works of Samuel Adams, Vol. II, page 229.

Fisher, Sydney George, The Struggle for American Independence, Vol. I, page 231.

Adams Charles Francis, Life and Works of John Adams, Vol. I, page 164 and Vol. II, page 387.

Stille, Chas. J. LLD. Life and Times of John Dickinson, Memoirs of Historical Society of Pa., Vol. XIII, page 136.

Pitkins, Timothy, Political and Civic History of the United States of America, Vol. I, page 299 to 300.

Frothingham, Richard, The Rise of the Republic of the United States, pages 362 to 368.

Galloway, Joseph. Ex., before H. of C. page 50.

CHAPTER IV.
RECEPTION OF THE PLAN.

In this Congress the votes were cast not by individuals but by each delegation as an individual body. The first three weeks of the session were taken up by the work of two committees -- one to state the rights of the colonies, the instances in which those rights had been violated, and the best means to obtain their restoration; and the other to examine and report upon the statutes affecting the trades and manufactures of the colonies.¹ These early deliberations evidenced the fact that Galloway was the Tories' party champion. Directly upon the presentation of his plan it met with much consideration and no little enthusiasm. It was debated for a whole day and the motion that it be further considered was carried by six colonies to five.² Its author set it forth and urged its adoption in an elaborate speech. The plan had the approbation of the loyalist governors, Franklin of New Jersey and Colden of New York. Duane, Jay, and Edward Butledge gave it their strong support. Just why it should have met with final defeat has never been authentically understood. But plausible conjectures may be anticipated in what Lieutenant Governor Colden, of New York, who was so situated as to know, wrote to Lord Dartmouth on December 7, 1774, "The Delegates from Virginia were the most violent of any -- those

¹Frothingham, Richard. The Rise of the Republic of the United States, pages 366 and 367.

²Sparks, J., The Works of Benjamin Franklin, Vol. VIII, page 145.

of Maryland and some of the Carolinians were little less so -- these Southern Gentlemen exceeded even the New England Delegates; they, together, made a majority that the others could have very little effect on."¹ Colden intentionally obscured the possible clarity of this statement.

Only twelve of the colonies were represented in the congress and of the votes of these that of Rhode Island was lost.² The expression "some of the Carolinians" doubtless designates a minority. Moreover knowledge of the conservation of all of the Carolinian delegates, except Gadsden, of South Carolina and Caswell of North Carolina has been apprized.³

Therefore, according to Colden, Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Haven, and Connecticut must have been the patriot colonies. Now these five lacked one to effect the majority of the eleven, and here hinged the fate of Galloway's plan. In his examination in the H. of C. he stated that there were colonies where five delegates voted down four others in opposition.⁴ New York happened to be the only colony the delegation of which consisted of nine member, hence it is evident that the vote of New York would decide the adoption or rejection of the proposed plan of accommodation. Like many great events in history this one was pivoted on the lone action of a single man. The vote of the New York delegation stood four to four while one member had not arrived.

¹New York Colonial Documents, Vol. VIII, pages 51 to 53.

²Ward's Diary. Mag. of American History, Vol. I, page 442.

³Magazine of American History, Vol. III, page 259.

⁴Galloway, Joseph, Examination before the H. of C., page 61.

This late comer was Simon Boerum, of King's County. Galloway, himself, is authority for the statement that this delegate was declared unanimously elected at a meeting attended only by himself and one other man. If credence can be given this, Wm. Boerum, his nephew, who lived with him at Brooklyn Ferry is likely to have been the man who cast that unanimous vote.¹ In so flagrant a usurpation of the policy that these delegations should represent the people, Galloway cannot be charged with presuming too much in believing that the vote that defeated the adoption of his plan did not express the will of the majority of the colonists. John Adam's Diary makes the impression that Duane and Jay leaned strongly toward union with the mother country, and the open political views of Low and Alsop clearly reveal their having been voted down.² Tracing the matter down to its final stages raises the irresistible suspicion that moving figures among the popular leaders did not scruple to make their influence felt as a dynamic force in directing the action of the New York delegation.

Samuel Adams and his party brought to bear all their efforts to prevail on the members of the congress to defeat the scheme upon its second reading. Further, if this means failed to effect rejection, the plan included incensing the Philadelphia mob against the conciliation movement. Mr. Adams' influence upon the lower ranks was at once strong and controllable and their state of mind was such that he could easily have drawn action from them. Galloway and his supporters were quick to see that their personal welfare

¹ Magazine of American History, Vol. III, page 260.

² Ibid, Vol. III, page 259.

depended on their not renewing the motion.¹ On October 22nd, by a vote of six colonies to five all proceedings connected with the proposed plan of union were ordered expunged from the proceedings that they might never be read or become public property. This careful precaution together with the meetings being secret did not however, prevent information concerning Galloway's plan becoming spread broadcast. The loyalists made special efforts through the distribution of printed copies to get the people acquainted with the project. Further they charged the congress with trying secretly to kill all efforts of reconciliation fearing that it would meet with the favor and support of the people.²

This plan in form and purpose was not without precedent. It closely resembles the plan of union of the Thirteen Colonies for their mutual protection and defense which was formulated by Benjamin Franklin and presented at the Albany Congress of 1754.³ Representation of the people in the legislature had its duplicate in the colonial governments through charters and grants from the crown, and all had their origin in the parliament of the mother country.

The adoption of the conciliatory plan would in effect have been a constitutional union between the colonies and the government of England. The grand council was to be "an inferior and distinct

¹Wells, Wm. Vincent, Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams, Vol. II, page 229.

²Fisher, Sydney George. The Struggle for American Independence, Vol. I, page 231.

³Morgan, Hon. Christopher, Documentary History of State of New York, Vol. IV, page 1072.

branch of the English Parliament and to be 'united and incorporated' with it."¹ Measures could originate in the legislative body either of England or of the colonies, but no act relating to the colonies should be valid unless it was accepted by both these bodies, thus in any case assuring the "consent of America." And this the patriots strongly claimed to be necessary to the validity of a law made for the colonies.²

The one exception to the check upon each other which was vested in these two legislative bodies related to taxation, and taxation without representation was one of the biggest bones of contention. The last article in the proposed plan provided that aids, granted to the crown in time of war by the grand council and approved by the president-general, should be valid and become law without the assent of the British Parliament being given.³ That the assent of the British legislative body should not be obtained for such a measure is almost inconceivably improbable unless it be desired to grant that the colonial aids might be so penurious as to incite the anger of Parliament to the extent that she would not accept them at all. A much more plausible cause of chagrin is seated in the fact that the loyalists were facilitating the means by which the mother country might more quickly come into possession of funds provided by the colonies for carrying on her wars. Although the direction of the exercise of this provision might unmistakeably be guided by the colonial legislature, it might originate

¹ Pitkin, Timothy. Political and Civil History of United States of America, Vol. I, page 300.

² Fisher, Sydney George. The Struggle for American Independence, Vol. I, page 231.

³ Journals of the Continental Congress. Vol. I, page 24.

in the British Parliament and in case there sat in the Philadelphia legislature a large majority of loyalists or in case of coercion being applied the results desired by the government of the mother country might be effected.

According to the loyalists' views this form of government would do away with all taxation and internal regulation on the part of the British government due to the fact that it vested in the American legislature a check in the veto power.¹ To be sure a bill that originated in Westminster might become a law binding on the colonies, but because it could not do so without their consent would virtually make it regulation on their part. Then, however, much better they may have thought themselves able to do the legislating for the colonies because of having in hand a better understanding of local conditions and situations, there still stood out the alluring possibility that the experience of the legislative body of the mother country would be an asset from which would accrue much that would meet the needs and steady the moves of a new people in a new country.

This same advantage would rest in part in the president-general providing he served the colonists' interests. If he were a person of much ability and believed that he best served England by doing the most possible to promote the growth of the colonies and the welfare of their people, a happier situation could hardly be contrived. However, the plan was not exhaustive. It did not provide for how the president-general should be paid, nor that the American legislature should be given the right of an expression as

- - - - -

¹Fisher, Sydney George, The Struggle for American Independence, Vol. I, page 231.

to whether or not a particular appointment of a president-general by the king would be acceptable to them, nor for making amendments when any part of the plan might be found inadequate to changed conditions.

Because the president-general was to be appointed by the king thus being an agent of the British government, it is to be implied that that government would pay him. Further it is just as truly logical to imply that he would serve that government whose servant he would be and which would be the source of his remuneration. With an executive at once placed in a position that would inevitably cause him to color the action he took toward every measure with the mutual interests that existed between him and the government whose agent he was, there could hardly be other than doubtful apprehensions raised in the minds of the popular leaders as to what would be the outcome of such an arrangement. The experiences of a number of the colonies with royal governors were of such a character as would make the patriots keen to throw all their weight against a possible repetition of such wrangling and oppression for the colonies combined.

Nor can it be assured that the legislature would have been immune from the influence of the king and his party through its own membership. There is not an utter lack of proof that chicanery was practiced then, no more than that same lack does not exist that much of it was practiced before and has been practiced since that time. Each colony was to retain its own legislature and every third year to elect representatives to the grand council. The result might very well be that the elections from the states that were strongly loyalist would make the membership of the central

legislature such that it with the king's agent would reduce the united colonies to no more than a single oppressed royal colony. On the other hand such a situation might herald an extreme reaction or the latter situation be the first to take place. A situation that would produce so strongly patriotic a central legislature that every governmental move, whether it would originate in England or in America would be held at bay by an unrelenting aggressive colonial policy or an equally unrelenting royal conservative policy.

Deep reflection on the part of the patriots must have revealed to them appalling possibilities of sinister subjection and oppression or of being helplessly fettered and thus thwarted from the aggressive ambitions that as we shall see later had unmistakably ingrained themselves in the fibre of this freedom-loving frontier's people. But the loyalists just as sincerely believed their's was the judicious policy for so young a people in a new country. Besides the mutual advantages to be gained and enjoyed by such a union were to them probably as stupendous as were the possibilities of being hampered and stunted as a people appalling to the patriots. The breadth of the policy of the king's party was so great as to make it much less easily grasped than the few tangible, really workable things which made up the policy of the colonist leaders.

It is generally conceded that local conditions centered in Massachusetts both accelerated and played a determining role in the actions taken in the First Continental Congress. The sentiment toward resistance of the mother country became much more popular among large numbers of colonists, many were still being torn between what seemed righteous forcible resentment and loyalty to mother country, and large numbers were "dyed in the wool" loyalists.

Nevertheless the situation in the Massachusetts Bay Colony ate into sentiment to an extent that produced radicalism that never would have been known without it. Expressions from the many colonies sent the Massachusetts Bay favoring her armed resistance and pledging their support is proof of the radical sentiment as is also the hope that a reconciliation with England could be effected, in the same step expressed, proof of the loyal sentiment. Though taxation without representation was an obstacle before which the colonists halted and upon which they refused to compromise, who is able to say that but for the bristling radical sentiment bred by English oppression exercised through the coercion acts, a plan like Galloway's might not have been accepted construing the representative legislature and the veto power to effect the required representation that would validate taxation by the English parliament or that taxes were being levied by the colonists themselves.

The possibilities that it held forth of meeting the needs of an arrangement that would effect the conciliation with the mother country that the colonists desired caused it to make an appeal that merits no small consideration.¹

¹Fisher, Sydney George, The Struggle for American Independence, Vol. I, page 231.

CHAPTER V.

EUROPEAN AND COLONIAL REASONS FOR PRESENTATION OF THE PLAN.

The plan was not an idle hobby of its author but his reasons, as he saw the situation, were fraught with the importance upon which hinged the destiny of two peoples. He believed the welfare of the colonies and that of England to be so vitally linked together that unless a permanent union were effected the one would be lost and the other would face the critical situation of probable subjection. In his mind the advantages for England contained in such a union were numerous and would determine whether that country would retain her place among the European nations or would become the servile province or provinces of one or more of them. He believed such union to be the desire of an overwhelming majority of the colonists and to be the only thing that would prevent their shortly be swallowed up probably by one of the European powers whose footing on American soil at this time was not a foreboding of insignificance.¹

The two nations whose ambition and aggressiveness, striving within itself to act more vigorously, which appealed to Galloway as most dangerous were France and Spain. The ambition of France, he declared was an universal European monarchy, and gaining separation on the part of the American colonists would place right in her possession a vast and peculiarly resourceful territory with 3,000,000 people already developing those resources. He further conjectured

- - - - -

¹Galloway, Joseph, Cool Thoughts, pages 3 to 5.

that with this great step in advance, it would be only logical that the allied interests of these two great powers would cause them to conceive of the idea of filling their coffers by becoming possessed of the rich gold and silver mines of South America. Spain already controlled so large a portion of that continent that at best Portuguese Brazil could not be a formidable obstruction.¹

Such a situation would have placed France and Spain so far in ascendancy that England's rank would totter. Gaining possession of the West Indies would be little more than an incident for these powers if the Americas were in their control. Be the graveness of this situation what it might, Galloway perceived what would be the direct results of separation between England and her colonies.

England was primarily a manufacturing country and the natural resources of the British Isles only appreciably more than began to be adequate to the supply of raw material needed for her manufactures. Neither could all Europe supply certain of the material that newly developed industries of manufacture in this island kingdom required. And there always stood out in more or less spectral form the possibility of settled arrangements between continental powers becoming stirred to hostility and completely shutting England off from some of its sources of raw material.

With her meager amount of isolated home territory and her vast amount of scattered foreign possessions, England's only hope

¹Galloway Joseph. Cool Thoughts, page 12 and 13.
Galloway Joseph. Plain Truth page 5.

of retaining and properly controlling them rested in her having control of the seas.¹ The American fisheries and the West Indies trade afforded this country a nursery for the training of seamen and sailors as no other one of her sea borne industries did. These two industries required her striking out across the open sea which entailed much greater risk than the trading she did with India, Africa, or the continent. With the greater risk was developed greater courage and bravery. Stronger, better equipped sailing stock was necessary and consequently more skilled manipulation had to be exacted. England had no other school for the training of navy men that compared with this one.

Besides this it was to the American colonies that England looked for the material from which she constructed her sea-going property. Here was her source of every kind of timber, much iron, and tar, pitch, and hemp.² The latter of these in quality compared favorably with the European grown and the extent of its culture in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys was already wide and promised to increase.

Besides losing the means by which she could constantly keep in training upwards of eighty thousand seamen, the source of raw material for her manufactures, and the building material for her sea vessels, England's separation from America would effect the loss of another lucrative trade. For her the New England fisheries had developed an extensive fish trade with the southern European countries. Most of these countries were solidly catholic and

¹Galloway, Joseph. Cool Thoughts, page 34.

²Galloway, Joseph. Cool Thoughts, page 31.

observed during each year a great many fast days. This feature of religious observance afforded a very profitable market for the English fish supplies because on these fast days it was fish that served as food in the abstinence from meat.¹ To England also the sugar of the West Indies was not a little important as a commodity of trade as well as an imported raw product.

Galloway comprehended what was at stake and its stupendousness forced him to strain every effort to preserve for his country what he believed it needed to retain its rank among European nations. And just as firmly did he believe himself to have at heart the interests of the colonies. He declared, "to be a subject of Great Britain is to be the freest subject of any civil community anywhere to be found on earth."² For him to have granted that the colonies would retain freedom if they got it would have been absurd. He could see the greedy and grasping hand of France already extended in readiness to seize the prey the possible releasing of which by England he deplored as depraved folly. That the colonies were to some extent obligated to England was not overlooked.³ In their infancy England's fostering hand had been welcomely felt and not a little English capital had been employed in developing trade from which they were reaping the harvest and would inherit upon separation. But with commendable fairness he set forth the infinitely greater rewards that were accruing and would still accrue to England by

¹ Galloway, Joseph. Cool Thoughts, page 33.

² Galloway, Joseph. Plain Truth, page 3.

³ Galloway, Joseph. Plain Truth, page 70.
Galloway, Joseph. Cool Thoughts, pages 57 to 60.

holding the colonies than those already enjoyed by the Americans from the mother country's sacrifices. However, he justified it as a legitimate contention for union.

Another pillar he held to support his plan was the fact that so large a proportion of the colonists wanted to continue relations of some satisfactory kind with England.¹ Public expressions on the part of many leaders who came in direct contact with the sentiment of the people confirmed his contention. During the session of the First Continental Congress in a letter that Washington wrote expressing his indignation at the English treatment of Massachusetts, he said, "I am well satisfied that no such thing (as independence) is desired by any thinking man in all North America; on the contrary, that it is the ardent wish of the warmest advocates for liberty that peace and tranquility, on constitutional grounds, may be restored, and the horrors of civil discord prevented."²

A similar expression of American sentiment at the same time came from Mr. Joseph Reed and was contained in his correspondence with the English secretary, Lord Dartmouth.. A wholesome frankness characterizes all this correspondence on the part of Mr. Reed and in his description of conditions in the colonies he does not disguise

- - - - -

¹Galloway, Joseph. Plain Truth, pages 16 and 32.

Galloway, Joseph. Candid Examination.

Galloway, Joseph. History and Political Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Republic page 5.

²Frothingham, Richard. The Rise of the Republic of the United States pages 369 to 370.

them. He laments the unhappy dispute between mother country and colonies and expressed himself as being happy to see and be able to state that for the parent state there exists, after all that has transpired, much of the affection that marked the happier days.¹

He further explained that he had exercised his efforts not to widen the breach but to mould the minds of the public to effect the adoption of such measures as might be "consistent with the true dignity of the mother country and the safety of this."²

Well we should mark that Washington and Reed wrote about conciliation by constitutional measures, about unhappy strife and still were pleased to speak of the discord as being civil, and about the cherished affection that still claimed a welcome place in the American breast. But just as truly must we guard against the error of overlooking the fact that invariably these expressions were of a dual character. Reed unmistakeably conveyed the idea that the American temper was not a lawless one but was careful that just as firm an impression should be given that it was not a servile one. Scanning his correspondence will leave no doubt in the reader's mind that Lord Dartmouth was assured that continued irritation on England's part would shortly bring about a dangerous state of affairs. After attempting to shed some light on conciliation as he believed he saw the possibilities of it a letter of his to the English secretary ended, "This country will be deluged with blood, before it will submit to taxation by any other power than it own legis-

- - - - -

¹American Biography, Sparks Jared -- Reed, Henry. Life of Joseph Reed. Ser. II, Vol. 8, page 276.

²Sparks, Jared, American Biography.-- Reed Henry, Life of Joseph Reed. Ser. II, Vol. 8, page 277.

lature."¹

Traditions peculiar to the mother country and feeling of sentiment for her were still far from obliterated from the colonists' mind. He was endowed with that filial selfishness that prompts the desire of any people to share the good things acquired through the ages by its ancestors. The bonds of direct family relationships still existed to a wide extent, and many things that administer directly to desires and to culture could, if at all, not be obtained by anything like the well-facilitated means by which England now supplied them. And there was no assurance, as the colonists interpreted the probable trend of affairs, that in case of separation England and America would not be pitched against each other in bitter antagonism for at least many piercingly uncertain years. So it was that a very appreciable majority strove with feverish anxiety to obtain permanent conciliation with England on terms of reciprocity, justice, and honor.² But human nature has more than one side and the early settlers of America were those people who would not submit to suppression in England, hence could that people and its posterity be presumed to be more pliable and more easily subjected to the will of what they believed to be a high-handed and tyrannous king and government, now that that fibre, that demanded that the execution of every act be in accordance with the dictates of conscience, had been hardened by experiences with the vicissitudes of the frontier. So it is shown not to have been an unnatural course for the colonists to have been just as stubbornly determined to

¹ Sparks, Jared. American Biography. -- Reed, Henry, Life of Joseph Reed, Ser. II, Vol. 8, page 278.

² Warren, Mercy, The American Revolution, Vol. I, page 148.

resort to armed resistance in case parliament continued to turn to them a deaf ear as they were feverishly determined not to leave unturned a single straw in their efforts to obtain from that same body a satisfactory constitutional conciliation.

Galloway, himself, and such other as Seabury and Duane freely condemned the policy of Great Britain.¹ As long as opposition did not assume more alarming proportions than what obtain in debate or other legal forms of resistance these and other conservatives co-operated effectively with the radicals in attempts to secure redress of grievances. But at the suggestion of armed resistance they rebelled. So it was that Galloway's efforts were directed to the single issue, conciliation. He saw that his duty lay in a straight line and that it was hemmed in by two formidable walls. On the one side was the radical party in congress whom, he believed, were representative of only a small minority of the American people. On the other hand lay the difficulty of bringing England to see of what import her action concerning the Colonies was. The king looked upon New England as in a state of rebellion and upon its people as a faction expressing hypocrisy, ingratitude, and treason. He sanctioned every measure for distressing the colonies as a means of whipping them into line. He believed it to be necessary little more than to lift a vigorous military hand for the crumbling of the opposition.² The intent of Galloway's policy would have effected union with no alternative and in a way the king's policy never could

¹Howard, George Elliott, Ph.D. Preliminaries of the Revolution, pages 314-5.

²Frothingham, Richard. The Rise of the Republic of the United States, pages 407 to 408.

have done. Much less did the king than Galloway reckon with the magnitude of the situation. The later desired not to see armed resistance although he supported and aided in its prosecution after it did break out. The king did not comprehend what proportions the struggle might easily assume, but Galloway was not unaware of what might be the role played in such a contest by England's "perfidious neighbors."

It was when he was imbued with these thoughts that he desperately strove with the mother country to bring her to a realization of what should be her action in the confronting situation. With such industrial resources at command, with such an opportunity of conquest and glory by virtue of what America was doing toward the sustenance and development of the navy, and with justice on her side, he deplored England's not displaying the keenest interest to smother the slightest possibility of separation that might arise.¹ He lamented her vacillating cat-and-mouse method of treating with the colonies as after the war broke out he railed at the half hearted way in which she carried on military actions and at the indifferent attitude of the British generals. He bitterly reproved England, who had in her history stretched forth her strong, helpful arm even to the aid of foreign countries, because she did not exert a livelier interest in her own subjects and in securing with them a permanent, satisfactory, constitutional agreement. He deplored the fact that England because she held the colonies would not see how valuable a prize they were particularly when other powers were not over-subtly concealing their desires to obtain that prize.²

¹ Galloway, Joseph. Plain Truth, page 74.

² Galloway, Joseph. Plain Truth, page 75.

CHAPTER VI.

GALLOWAY'S INFIDELITY.

But sincerely and ardently as Galloway prosecuted his attempts to secure conciliation between England and the colonies he failed. The loyalist party dates in reality from about the time of the First Continental Congress, 1774.¹ In this party, unless it be attributed to Hutchinson, Joseph Galloway was the most conspicuous and aggressive leader.² The party's greatest activity was during the time from the fall of 1774 to the summer of 1776 when the Declaration of Independence was issued. Its work, its character, its principles, and the numbers of its supporters demand that it be given a more than inferior place in the history of America. The party abhorred separation and did not support the expediency of the refusal to pay taxes levied by Parliament. However, to Galloway are to be attributed not a few protests against England's oppressive measures.³ But the party as a whole held that oppressive taxes had not been laid and that there was no liklihood that such would be imposed. Why, then, they contended, enter civil strife to resist at yet unabused precedents and when there was no probability of

Howard, George Elliott, Ph.D. Preliminaries of the Revolution, page 320 and 321.

Howard, George Elliott, Ph.D. Preliminaries of the Revolution, page 316.

Sabine, Loren, Biographical Sketches of the Loyalists of the American Revolution, Vol. I, page 454.

Winsor, Justin, Narrative and Critical History of America, Vol. 6, page 235.

their being abused. Long after 1776 loyalist sentiment was nursed and at intervals of not great length expression cropped out to the effect that the possibility of conciliation was not obliterated.

Galloway was a strong loyalist but the time had been when he was a strong patriot. He was not a turn-coat in that different party names are applied to his principles. Before and even for some time after 1763, all Americans were patriots, and Galloway's principles and purpose never changed though his actions did. His purpose was directed in a path as straight as a bee line, yet right-fully is he denounced as treacherous and as a traitor to the American people. Doubtless he had at heart the interests both of England and the colonies in many things he did that cannot be given scrupulous sanction.

By every member of this congress an oath of secrecy was taken. Doubtless a number were guilty of being recreant, but a letter from London received at this time by Samuel Adams witnesses to the fact that Galloway violated his word of honor. In that letter is read, "Mr. ----- of New York and Mr. G-----y of Philadelphia have certainly communicated to administration, through an indirect channel, the secrets of your Congress."¹ However Galloway and Duane during the Congress had a different idea of whom it was to whom treason should be attributed. Near the end of the session Congress adopted five resolves concerning Massachusetts.² One of these agreed upon October 8th, 1774 approved the opposition set up

¹ Morgan, Hon. Christopher, Documentary History of New York, Vol. IV, page 1072.

² Wells, Wm. Vincent, Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams, Vol. II, page 312.

³ Frothingham, Richard. The Rise of the Republic of the U. S. page 269.

by the inhabitants of that colony to the coercion acts, and further stated that all Americans ought to support Massachusetts in that opposition in case forcible execution of these acts should be attempted. These two loyalists opposed vigorously and asked permission to enter on the journals a protest against it. Their request was overruled and upon leaving the congress they compared data and made memoranda to the effect that they had objected to the measure on the grounds of its treasonableness. This was not at all an inconsistent step on the part of these men.

Galloway was a lawyer of recognized ability yet like other men of high position he was not immune from diplomatic slips. While a member of the Continental Congress he published a pamphlet relating to the current strife. Samuel Wharton writing in England to Dr. Franklin made significant comments on it. One of puzzling interest is obtained in the excerpt that reads, "I am really grieved at the publication of Mr. Galloway's extraordinary pamphlet. Our great friends in both Houses are extremely angry at it; while the courtiers rejoice at that part of the pamphlet, which represent our divisions and controversies, as to boundaries and modes of religion, our incompetency to resist the power of this country, and the undecided state of congress for several weeks as to what really were the rights of America. Yet the courtiers at the same time, treat with ineffable contempt the plan of union proposed; and which, they say, by not being adopted, offended the authors pride, and has been the happy means of their being satisfactorily confirmed in their ideas of the weakness and division of the colonies; and that, by perseverance, they shall unquestionably obtain a perfect

submission."¹ In the first instance a treatise about which this could be written must have directly violated that oath of secrecy. Secondly it could hardly have been more impolitic for him to have written what would create sentiment like the above when a plan like his awaited the pleasure of a dangerously evenly divided patriotic and loyalist congress.

Further Galloway's treachery is attested to by his employment of misrepresentations and his ascription of mean motives to his political oponents. This largely unwarranted defaming of those who opposed his policy revealed a lack of integrity of character and showed him unworthy of the popular confidence that once attended him.² He was elected as a delegate from Pennsylvania to the Second Continental Congress and even though Dr. Franklin importuned him to serve his colony in this capacity he positively declined.³ All that can be advanced as reasons for his not accepting the position are the failure of his plan and the odium that was attaching to him due to unpopularity that developed for him late in the first congress and to certain little deeds of treachery that had revealed themselves. Hardly could an objection be raised by him to the commission with which the second delegation was charged for in essence it was identical with that of the first. However, on June 14th, 1776, certain of the restrictions that this commission embodied were removed and thus was the delegation enabled to cast

- - - - -

¹ Sparks, Jared. The Works of Benjamin Franklin, Vol. 8, p 145.

² Frothingham, Richard. The Rise of the Republic of the United States, page 367 to 368.

³ Journals of the Continental Congress, 1775, Vol. II, page 17.
Winsor, Justin, Narrative and Critical History of America Vol. VI, page 235.

the vote of the province for independence.

The actual treason that must be laid to the account of this man whose purpose never swerved had its origin upon his joining the British army at New Brunswick, New Jersey in December, 1776.¹ Directly he advised the British to attack Philadelphia by the Delaware. During the occupation of that city by the red coats, he served England as superintendent of prohibited articles at the port and as superintendent of the city police. A characteristic expression of the contempt in which his move had placed him was given in the following lines which appeared in public print shortly after he joined Howe near Trenton:

"Gall'way has fled, and joined the venal Howe,
To prove his baseness, see him cringe and bow;
A traitor to his country, and its laws,
A friend to tyrants, and their cursed cause.
Unhappy wretch! Thy interst must be sold,
For continental, not for polish'd gold;
To sink the memory, thou thyself cried down,
And stabb'd thy country, to support the crown.

Go to and fro, like Lucifer on earth,
And curse the Being that first gave thee birth;
Away to Scotland, and thyself prepare,
Coal dust and brimstone is their only fare;
Fit materials for such Tory blood,

¹Sabine Lorenzo, Biographical Sketches of the Loyalists of the American Revolution, Vol. I, page 454.

Who wrong their country, and deny their God;
 There herd with, Bute, Mansfield, and his brother,
 Bite, twist, sting, and poison one another.¹

Attended by shame and soon to be reduced to poverty, Gallo-
 way went to England in October of 1778. In 1780 and directly
 following, his pen was particularly busy in giving the public his
 opinions and reflections on the colonial situation and what he be-
 lieved to be the expedient method for England to employ in prosecut-
 ing her own and her former American subjects' interests. In
 America he was a man of wealth and a gentleman of the aristocracy,²
 but after he went to England his life was attainted and the Pennsylv-
 vania assembly confiscated his property the estimated value of
 which was 40,000 lb.³ For this his only recompense was a small
 pension granted him by the English parliament. At Watford,
 Hertfordshire on the 29th of August 1803 occurred the demise of
 this man who maintained his steadfastness of purpose at the sacri-
 fice of his personal honor and his people's trust.

¹Moore, Frank, Diary of the American Revolution, Vol I,
 page 369.

²Winsor, Justin, Narrative and Critical Hist of America,
 Vol. 6, page 235.

³Sabine Lorenzo, Biographical Sketches of the Loyalists of
 the American Revolution, Vol. I, page 455.

CHAPTER VII.
FAILURE OF THE PLAN.

After attributing to Galloway's plan all that is possible both in the way of merits and defects and after speculating within all legitimate bounds as to what it might have effected, its failure of adoption must be accorded in far less degree to any inherent attribute of the plan itself than to the reef upon which it foundered.

In casting the die by which the future of America should be shaped, a bitter contest was being waged by two opposing forces on common ground. As has already been shown numberless expressions came from persons in positions to reflect the public sentiment and invariably this was strongly against separation from England.¹ In the avowed and expressed purpose of the First Continental Congress is to be noted a significant precaution. The explicit reason for its being assembled and sitting at all was set forth as, "For concerting proper measures for the recovery and establishment of the just rights and liberties of the Americans, and for the restoration of that union and harmony between Great Britain and America most ardently desired by all good men." In the words "recovery" and "restoration" rings clear the colonial appeal to bring back the relations that existed with the mother country prior

- - - - -

¹Abbott, Jacob, American History, War of the Revolution page 21 and 22.

to 1763.¹ At this time it was but a negligible number² of Americans who entertained thoughts of permanent disunion, and the purpose in part of setting forth the object of the congress in this language was to guard against the possibility of its being suspected to be treasonably inclined. This filial affection for the mother country nourished in the breasts of the colonists and the appeal made to their judgment that by permanent union their welfare would best be served constitute one of these powerful underlying forces.

The origin of the other is traced by the fact that at this time there are English Americans who have encroached upon the copper skins' country. "Just rights" and "liberties" give unmistakeable evidence of the hold this force had procured. Beginning with the time 1628, that Charles I fought with his parliament and for the ten years following -- the period of that monarch's personal rule-- the Puritans had migrated to America in great numbers. In 1628 was seen the rise of Salem, in 1630 Boston sprang up, and Harvard College was established in 1636. On the heels of this, or in the last decade of the first half of the seventeenth century, the English civil war broke out between the Anglicans and the Puritans.³ The Puritans were still a large and formidable faction in England and during the Inter-regnum may well often have felt that they were

¹ Galloway, Joseph, History and Political Reflection on the Rise and Progress of the American Republic, page 5.

² Galloway, Joseph, Examination before H. of C. page 12.

³ Galloway, Joseph, History and Political Reflection on the Rise and Progress of the American Republic, page 116.

Winsor, Justin, Narrative and Critical History of America, Vol. VI, page 241.

coming to their own. But when the Restoration was effected under a king who exerted his every effort toward absolutism and the restoration of the Catholic Church, the Puritans seemed hopelessly crushed.¹ During the Clarendon period of this reign -- 1660-1667-- was passed the Clarendons Code, two of the acts of which, the Conventicle Act and the Five Mile Act, supplied the straw that broke the camel's back for great numbers of these dissenters. This effected another tremendous migration to America.

Already for near half a century had the spark of resistance to oppression been fanned. Now fuel was added that developed a glow of undefineable patriotism that permeated every American breast and later directed their destiny into a path the expedience of following which their cool judgment questioned. This does not present a new principle directing human destiny, but is merely another exemplification of the fact that has stood through all time that peoples and nations will sacrifice their lives rather than their religions.

Here was represented the Presbyterians to whom must be attributed the representative feature in our government; the Congregationalists or Independents to whom can be traced the later policy of sectionalism that **cropped out** at irregular intervals for years to come; and the Quakers. These were the men that constituted the congress to which Galloway presented his plan. It was the relation between church and state that had driven them from England and they began to apprehend the possibility of that same close

¹Galloway, Joseph, History and Political Reflection on Rise and Progress of American Revolution page 22 and 23.

relation fastening itself upon them in the country to which they had fled to be free from it. Here was pitted in the life and death struggle the two forces one of which must determine the colonies' destiny. The one of these stood for the desire to be permanently united with England, the other stood for the rights and liberties of the American people at all cost.

Galloway believed his plan would merge these two outstanding factors and that its operation after adoption would serve as a leaven smoothing out all knotty difficulties. What it might have accomplished or probably would have failed in has been given consideration. Like a band of steel were the colonists bound by the sentiment they nourished for the mother country, but no connections however strongly or closely filial could withstand the pressure from within that was exerted by that principle born and bred into them in England in the sixteenth century. For this principle, the right to live and to worship according to the dictates of their conscience, many of them had died and many more bled in England in the seventeenth century which century also marks their planting foot on the American continent. This undertaking they prosecuted imbued with that lofty ideal of establishing for themselves and their posterity that freedom to worship their God as their conscience taught them. The hardships of frontier life did not cause them to think the less of this right but each added hardship was met and overcome by more ardent zeal for its support. Such loyalty to a principle had, by its very nature, to develop an unassailable strength. Galloway knew to what to attribute the failure¹ of his plan though not until

- - - - -

¹ Winsor, Justin, Narrative and Critical History of America, Vol. VI, page 241.

later did the cause stand out clearly delineated. This contributes to enhance the appreciation of what confronted Galloway in his attempt to effect the cherished union. The great advantages that he could see for both England and the colonies in a permanent union supplied him with a positive motive, and a negative motive presented itself in formulating a plan that would effectively assail the well-nigh impregnable wall that the colonists' demand for rights and liberties had come to be. Impregnable did that wall prove to be. It pushed its way up slowly but just as surely did it cleave every obstruction that it met. Before it broke Galloway's plan and by it with bitter and struggling reluctance was torn from the American breast the sentiment it nourished for England. Galloway was opposed to independence and deplored republics as degrading. Preservation of union was his paramount object but the patriots would not yield one iota in their demands for rights and liberties.¹ Here stood patriots and loyalists face to face both confronted with the necessity of decision. Galloway with all his plan meant to represent could do no more than present it for both parties' consideration whereas the principles of the patriots were not being placed at the mercy of a choice. They were not being contested and grounded as they were in the bone and sinew of this frontiers' trained people obliterated any possibility of Galloway's or any other plan of union with England being adopted if in that plan could be detected the slightest trace of an opening through which the British government might develop the means by which a restraining or curtailing of American rights and liberties might be effected.

¹Frothingham Richard, Rise of the Republic of the United States page 366 and 367.

CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUSION.

As Galloway led the loyalists so the patriots were led by an even more aggressive statesman, Samuel Adams. Though two forces, the one if not declining certainly not being strengthened by time and the other undergoing a slow but certain development, attended the colonial growth; yet for something more than a decade which had marked English attempts at colonial imposition, there had been growing a subtle influence that showed up in the First Continental Congress and was championed by John and Samuel Adams. Contrary to may contemporary expressions there is evidence¹ that some few of the popular leaders had entertained the belief that separation from England would soon be the only means that would obtain for the colonies that which they would demand.² Verification of the development of this belief is had in Samuel Adams' admission of it when the Declaration of Independence had been passed.

Galloway labored earnestly to accomplish his purpose and Adams labored just as earnestly and more effectively to thwart that purpose. No great issue ever absorbed a people's thought but what concerning it great thinkers held diametrically opposed views. As strongly as the loyalist leader may have believed the interests of the colonies to lie in union with England, his adversary probably

- - - - -

¹Galloway, Joseph, History and Political Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Revolution, page 60.

²Howard, George Elliott, Ph.D., Preliminaries of the Revolution, page 316.

exceeded him in the opposite opinion. Adams believed it wise to seize the situation and settle it once for all instead of effecting a union with the imminent probability of continued recurrences of like disorders.

Whether by his keen perception and foresight he ascertained the belief that the English outrages would cause all the Americans shortly to clamour for independence, or whether he believed independence to be the best thing for the people though it might take them some years yet to come to a full realization of it, is not known. However, by the time he sat in the First Continental Congress he openly directed his efforts toward bringing about complete separation. When he had become convinced of the feasibility of an undertaking he prosecuted it with unrelenting ardor. Galloway in attempting to convey an impression of his ability as political management in the congress of 1774 characterized him and commented on his activities by saying, "he eats little, drinks little, sleeps little, thinks much, and is most indefatigable in the pursuit of his object. It was this man, who, by his superior application, managed, at once, the factions in congress at Philadelphia, and the factions of New England."¹ This man's activities, the skill with which he marshalled them, and the ardor with which he prosecuted them peculiarly fitted him to serve as the governor of the dynamic machinery by which was generated the power that effectively thwarted England's attempt to hold them as subordinate provinces. By organization of his party Adams made its work count. The loyalists did

¹Pitkin, Timothy. Political and Civil History of the United States, Vol. I, page 301.

Galloway, Joseph, History and Political Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Revolution, page 67.

not embrace this expedient and their efforts availed little. The revolutionary party rapidly acquired possession of the government and appreciably silenced opposition.¹

The destiny of America was being held in the balance. Which way would the balance tip? Would she remain a subordinate colonial province and strengthen harmonious united relations with England or would she sever all constitutional connections with that country and launch upon the sea of independent rule and independent social, economic, and political development?

As has been pointed out Americans had become possessed of a deeply rooted characteristic the weight of which would inevitably turn the balance for their separation from England. The foundation upon which such action rested had been laid with the settlement of the earliest colonists. It was the radicals, whose principles were of so assertive a nature as to make them leave England and seek their home on foreign soil,² that furnished the nucleus of the American nation. England had developed a strong ideal of imperialism but active radicalism was seated in America and each attempt made ^{by} the the Empire to subject the colonies to measures in keeping with the imperialistic idea was met by action from the colonists that showed a strong coloring of self-interest. This attitude had developed by the time of the Continental Congress to a place where the colonies felt the possibility of their being able to stand free from the mother country. Upon the people had become

Howard, George Elliott, Ph.D., Preliminaries of the Revolution, pages 214 and 215.

Van Tyne, Claude Halstead Ph.D., The American Revolution, pages 4 and 5.

Lincoln, Chas. H., The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, Vol. I, pages 7 and 8.

so firmly fastened the principle of rights and liberties that it was a vital part of them. The loyalists presented so much to support their views and their beliefs of what would be the expedient move for America that no one thing struck home with force. On the other hand in the patriots was ingrained what they stood for and any attempt made to move them from their fixed resolve was doomed to utter defeat.

So stood and continued to grow that great unshakeable principle that in 1776 the Declaration of Independence embodied. Some fell from it and assailed it but each reverse to which it was subjected aided its crystallization. In far greater numbers was it embraced and supported. Though in the First Continental Congress it was not outwardly visible, it unmistakeably assumed the form of a kernel that was surely developing into a barrier even then not successfully assailed by Galloway.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 082198596